

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 17, 2006, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-18 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which is the invention. Claim 19 has been added. No new matter has been added. An RCE is filed herewith. Claims 1-19 are submitted for consideration.

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0214970 to Pimentel in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0131083 to Arques. According to the Office Action, Pimentel discloses all of the elements of claims 1-18 except for a bearer independent protocol providing access to bearers. Therefore, the Office Action combined Pimentel and Arques to yield all of the elements of claims 1-18. The rejection is traversed as being based on references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claim 1, 9 and 13 and the dependent claims thereon, in addition to newly added claim 19.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-8 depend, recites a method including transmitting a messaging service message from a sender in a first system having a first structure for messages to a receiver of a second system having a second structure for the messages. The method also includes utilizing a bearer independent protocol in the transmission of the message between a server and a user equipment, wherein the bearer independent protocol provides access to bearers.

Claim 9, upon which claims 10-12 depend, recites a telecommunication system that includes a first system having a first structure for messaging service messages and a second system having a second structure for the messages. The system also includes a server via which a message is transmitted from the first system to the second system, the server being configured to utilize a bearer independent protocol for transmitting the message, wherein the bearer independent protocol provides access to bearers.

Claim 13, upon which claims 14-15 depend, recites a server configured to utilize a bearer independent protocol for transmitting a message from a first system having a first structure for messaging service messages and a second system having a second structure for the messages. The bearer independent protocol provides access to bearers.

As outlined below, Applicant submits that the cited references of Pimentel and Arques do not teach or suggest the elements of claims 1-19.

Pimentel teaches a wireless application gateway for communicating between a wireless device and a backend system. The wireless application gateway includes an application programming interface, a protocol layer, a transport layer and a configuration file. The application programming interface receives a mobile-terminated message from the backend system and sends a formatted mobile-originated first protocol using a characteristic of the mobile-terminated message. The protocol layer generates formatted mobile-terminated messages using the first protocol and generates the formatted mobile-originated messaging using a second protocol. The transport layer sends the formatted mobile-terminated message to a short message service center and receives the mobile-

originated message. The configuration file includes a parameter used to choose the first and second protocols. The mobile-terminated message is sent to the wireless device using a static identifier of the wireless device and the mobile-originated message is sent to the backend system using a dynamic identifier of the wireless device. See at least paragraph 0014 and the Abstract.

Arques discloses that a mobile station is composed of an item of mobile equipment and a smart card SIM. Arques also discloses that communication within the mobile station, that is, between the SIM card and the mobile equipment, is governed according to a bearer independent protocol defining a set of command and situations and enabling the SIM card to use communication means of the mobile equipment. See at least paragraphs 0007 and 0008 of Arques.

Applicant submits that the combination of Arques and Pimentel simply does not teach or suggest each element recited in claims 1-18. Each of independent claims 1, 9 and 13, in part, recites utilizing a bearer independent protocol in the transmission of the message, wherein the bearer independent protocol provides access to bearers. As noted in the Office Action, Pimentel does not teach or suggest a bearer independent protocol providing access to bearers. Therefore, the Office Action combined Pimentel and Arques to yield this element of the presently pending claims.

As noted above, Arques discloses that communication within the mobile station, that is, between the SIM card and the mobile equipment, is governed according to a bearer independent protocol. There is simply no teaching or suggestion in Arques of

using bearer independent protocol between the mobile equipment and the network, as recited in the presently pending claims. Based on the teachings of Arques, one skilled in the art might conclude that Arques suggests the use of bearer dependent protocols between the mobile equipment and the network. Thus, the combination of Pimentel and Arques teaches the use of bearer independent protocols within a mobile station and the use of bearer dependent protocols elsewhere, contrary to the presently pending claims.

Specifically, the combination of Pimentel and Arques fails to teach or suggest utilizing a bearer independent protocol in the transmission of the message between a server and user equipment, as recited in claim 1, a server configured to utilize a bearer independent protocol, as recited in claim 9, and utilizing a bearer independent protocol in transmission of a message between a sender of the message and a receiver of the message, as recited in claim 13. Therefore, Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Pimentel nor Arques, whether taken singly or combined teaches or suggests each element of claims 1, 9 and 13 and hence, dependent claims 2-8, 10-12 and 14-15 thereon, at least because of their dependence on claims 1, 9 and 13, respectively, and because of additional limitations recited in each of claims 2-8, 10-12 and 14-15.

As noted previously, claims 1-19 recite subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art references cited in the Office Action. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-19 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Arlene P. Neal
Registration No. 43,828

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

APN:kmp

Enclosures: RCE Transmittal
Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time
Additional Claim Fee Transmittal
Check No.15317